



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/647,777	12/29/2000	Hiroyuki Morimoto	2500.6	3913

5514 7590 01/26/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

TRAN, SUSAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/647,777	Applicant(s) MORIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Susan T. Tran	Art Unit 1615	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 42-70.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

ADVISORY ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 42-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It appears that applicant's specification does not provide support for the limitations:

- 1) "without destroying said granule bearing a coating film";
- 2) "without destroying the granule";

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al. EP 0 650 826 A1, in view of Roche US 5,075,114.

Art Unit: 1615

Morimoto teaches a tablet compressing method using tableting machine with lubricant spraying mean (see abstract). The method comprising spraying lubricant uniformly on the surface of an upper punch, a lower punch, and a die, filling the die with pharmaceutical materials, and compressing the pharmaceutical material to form a drug tablet (columns 2-3 and columns 5-7).

Morimoto does not teach the specific form of pharmaceutical material being claimed, such as, coated granule or granule in a matrix base. Nonetheless, Morimoto teaches that his tableting method can be used for tableting many kinds of tablets such as powdered or granular medicine, and so on (column 7, lines 34-38).

Roche teaches a medicament tablet comprising granules coated with polymers blend (see abstract and column 2, lines 45-60). The resulting coated granules were then compressed into tablet form using tableting machine having die wall and punches (columns 9-10). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the pharmaceutical materials to be tabletted in Morimoto using the coated drug granule in view of the teaching of Roche, because the references teach the use of compressed tableting machine to compress pharmaceutical materials.

Claims 42-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsushima et al. US 6,036,974, in view of Roche US 5,075,114.

Tsushima teaches a method for preparation of tablet comprises preparing the tableting material containing medicines and excipients, coating on the surface of the tableting material a lubricant, coating the surface of the punches with lubricant, filling

Art Unit: 1615

the die with the coated tableting material, and compressing to obtain tablet (columns 2 and 6).

Tsushima does not teach the specific form of pharmaceutical material being claimed, such as, coated granule in a matrix base.

Roche teaches a medicament tablet comprising granules coated with polymers blend (see abstract and column 2, lines 45-60). The resulting coated granules were then compressed into tablet form using tableting machine having die wall and punches (columns 9-10). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the tableting materials of Tsushima using the coated drug granule in view of the teaching of Roche, because the references teach the use of compressed tableting machine to compress pharmaceutical materials.

It is noted that the reference is silent as to the teaching of the percent amount of lubricant being coated onto the surface of the die and punches. However, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to, by routine experimentation determine a suitable amount of lubricant to obtain a smooth surface tablet. As well as the dividing line on the tablet, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, because dividing line, groove line, marking line, or scored tablet is well known in pharmaceutical

art. Moreover, absent of evident on the contrary, the burden is shifted to applicant to provide data showing the amount of surfactant uses by the cited references do not fall within the claimed range.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The 112, 1st paragraph is maintained because while applicants' specification discloses the coating or the matrix base is not destroyed, see pages 16-19 disclose "the film isn't destroyed" or the matrix isn't damage" (pages 16-19), nowhere in the specification disclose granule or coated granule isn't destroyed.

Applicant argues that neither Morimoto nor Tsushima disclose use of granules including active substance covered with a coating film, or the granule including active substance in a base matrix. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Morimoto or Tsushima is cited in combination with Roche.

Applicant argues there is no motivation to combine Morimoto or Tsushima with Roche because it is not seen that there are any common technical problems sought to be addressed among the references. In response to applicant's argument, the test for

Art Unit: 1615

obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Morimoto is relying on for the teaching that the tableting method can be used for tableting many kinds of tablets such as powdered or granular medicine, and so on (column 7, lines 34-38); and Tsushima is relying on for the teaching that the medicine can be filled in a small diameter seamless capsule (microcapsule) and then to mix this with wet powder before introduced into the mold. Accordingly, the "many kinds of tablets" materials such as microcapsule, powdered or granular medicine, and so on suggests the combination with Roche.

Applicant argues that the examiner has disregarded the discussion of the unexpected results submitted by applicant's specification. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner in the final rejection had fully considered the data from table 2

Art Unit: 1615

submitted by applicant. However, the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish unexpected results over the cited references. Applicant states that the tablet achieved by the present invention is superior in its rapid disintegrability comparing to the tablets described in the cited references. However, table 2 of applicant's specification at page 50 discloses disintegration time of the claimed tablet is 6.0 minute comparing to the comparison example of 10.2 minutes. However, applicant's attention is called to the cited references, for example, Tsushima at table 2, column 10, discloses a disintegration time of 0.6 minutes. Accordingly, applicant has not submitted a side-by-side comparison between the claimed invention and those of the cited references.

Correspondence


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan T. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-0606. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page, can be reached at (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1615

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


WILLIAM K. PAGE
SUPERVISOR/PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER FP 1600